REMARKS

As a result of the above amendments, claims 38-70 remain pending. Claims 38, 39, 47 49, 50, 58, 60, 61, and 69 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Rejections of Independent Claims 38, 49, and 60 Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner has rejected claims 38, 49, and 60, alleging U.S. Patent No. 6,018,732 (*Bertrand et al.*) anticipates each of these independent claims. Applicant traverses these rejections based on *Bertrand et al.* However, Applicant has amended these claims to clarify the context of the invention at least in relation to *Bertrand et al.* A brief recitation of the present invention and then a brief recitation of *Bertrand et al.* may assist in better understanding the distinguishing features and applications between the present invention and *Bertrand et al.*

The present invention is directed to a method in claim 38, a computer readable medium having instructions for generally carrying out the method in claim 38 (claim 49), and an apparatus for generally carrying out the method of claim 38 (claim 60). Thus, Applicant refers to the method of claim 38 for the purpose of this recitation. Claim 38 is directed to a method of three separate and distinct aspects of authoring, generating, and using a compliance application.

The first aspect is an "authoring" phase, wherein a person who possesses certain expertise, such as a knowledge expert, may enter questions, potential answers, solutions, and Boolean logic rules (connecting the questions, potential answers, and solutions) into the system. The second aspect is a "generating" phase, wherein a plurality of pages are generated based on the expert's input. The third aspect is a "using" phase, wherein an end user in need of the expertise captured in the plurality of pages can navigate through the plurality of pages based on the rules entered by the expert by reading questions and selecting answers to arrive at a solution. However, these aspects and ultimately the "using" phase, are not in the context of a learning or training simulation.

Specifically, the application generated as a part of the present invention is for complying with a task, such as, for example, changing out a hard drive in a computer. In this example of an application, the user may be asked "what is the make and model of your computer" and be given a list of makes and models to choose from. The question and potential answers are entered by the knowledge expert, such as a computer hardware servicing expert, in the authoring phase. There is no wrong answer as long as the user (in the "using" phase) chooses from the list

provided and does not try to answer in a manner that is not a part of the syntax. After the user selects the make and model, the user may then be asked "what is the size of your hard drive," and be given a listing of sizes to choose from. The user may then be asked if he/she has backed up his/her hard drive, and be given a "yes" or a "no" to choose from. These questions and answers, which have been entered by the computer servicing expert in the authoring phase, continue until the user has solved the problem facing the user – changing out the hard drive.

In each of the question and answer steps in the example provided above, there were only "correct" answers for complying with the task at hand. The paths with which the task may be achieved are many, but none "wrong." Thus, since "wrong" answers are not a part of complying with the task, "wrong" answers cannot be tracked and are not tracked. This is significantly different from learning and training simulations in which wrong answers are typically tracked, and suggestions and training modules are launched or suggested in response to one or more wrong answers or some analysis of the wrong answers.

The amendments to claim 38, and the other independent claims, make clear the context of the present invention. For ease of understanding, the added portions of amended claim 38 are shown in underline below. As stated, in one form of the invention the compliance application, as authored and generated, interacts with a user to find a solution to a problem through the user answering a series of questions and/or following a series of steps. The method is not directed to a learning or training application. The method is for compliance in accomplishing as task. As such, within the authoring phase, the method receives a first question, a second question, and a third question from an expert, wherein none of the first, second, and third questions have an answer which is incorrect. As stated above, none of the answers are "wrong" answers, since the application is directed to compliance of accomplishing a task, not for "learning," although learning may be a by-product of such task compliance and accomplishment.

The method further receives a first potential answer to the first question and a second potential answer to the first question from the expert, wherein both the first and second potential answers to the first question are correct answers to the first question, and wherein the first and second answers are utilized in a non-dynamic and pre-populated manner to create a compliance path. This step at least indicates there can be multiple correct answers to each question in every step of each compliance path. In addition, when the compliance application is being authored, the answers are populated in a database, and no further information is added to the database after

"generation" of the compliance application. Thus, the compliance application is "pre-populated." This process is non-dynamic, contrary to true expert systems in which learning from continued data input occurs, which can affect probability models that do not exist in the present invention.

The present invention further receives a first potential answer to the second question and a second potential answer to the second question from the expert, wherein both the first and second potential answers to the second question are correct answers to the second question, and wherein the first and second answers are utilized in a non-dynamic and pre-populated manner to create the compliance path. Similar concepts apply to this step as the previously mentioned step.

The present invention further receives a solution to the problem from the expert, the solution being an answer and/or a step for the user to follow for use in the compliance application. Again, use of the compliance application is not for learning, it is for accomplishing a task.

In order to move from one step to the next along a path in the compliance application to accomplish the task, rules must be inputted to define the possible paths. Thus, the method receives a first Boolean logic rule from the expert, the first Boolean logic rule associating the first potential answer to the first question, the first potential answer to the second question, and the third question, the first Boolean logic rule being utilized within the compliance application for directing the user through the compliance path for complying with the compliance application. In moving from one step to the next, the method may also receive a second Boolean logic rule from the expert, the second Boolean logic rule associating the first potential answer to the first question, the second potential answer to the second question, and the solution, the second Boolean logic rule being utilized within the compliance application for directing the user through the compliance path for complying with the compliance application.

The rules generated by the system of the present invention are "complex." Specifically, a rule in the system of the present invention can require responses from more than one previous question. In addition, a rule result can be another question or a solution. These rules are not just simple "vectors" or hyperlinks that take a single answer and move the user to a predetermined page.

As a practical way of implementing the method, the plurality of pages are generated based on the first question, the second question, the third question, the first potential answer to

the first question, the second potential answer to the first question, the first potential answer to the second question, the second potential answer to the second question, the first Boolean logic rule, the second Boolean logic rule, and the solution. The pages can have one or more of the above questions, answers, rules, and/or solutions thereon. In one form of the invention, the method transmits a first page of the plurality of pages to the user, the first page displaying the first question to the user. A first response is then received from the user, wherein the first response is indicative of one of the first potential answer to the first question and the second potential answer to the first question As indicated above, if the first response is in correct syntax, the first response will always be correct. At least one of the first and second potential answers to the first question will match the first response and lead to a further step within the compliance path or to the solution within the compliance path.

The method also transmits a second page of the plurality of pages to the user, the second page displaying the second question to the user as a part of the further step within the compliance path. A second response is received from the user, wherein the second response is indicative of one of the first potential answer to the second question and the second potential answer to the second question. Again, if the second response is in correct syntax, the second response will always be correct, and wherein at least one of the first and second potential answers to the second question will match the second response and lead to a further step within the compliance path or to the solution within the compliance path.

After receiving responses from the user, the method executes at least one of the first Boolean logic rule to produce a first rule result which is indicative of the next step in the compliance path, and the second Boolean logic rule to produce a second rule result, which may also be indicative of the next step in the compliance path or may be indicative of the even further step within the compliance path. This will depend on the rules and the rule result.

The method then finally transmits a third page to the user, the third page displaying the third question to the user if the first rule result is positive as the next step in the compliance path, the second page displaying the further step in the compliance path or the solution to the user if the second rule result is positive. Thus, the third page will either present a next or further step, which for example, may be a further question, or the ultimate solution may be provided and the task accomplished.

It is significant to note that the present invention allows for freeform construction (authoring and generation), and provides the author with the ability to drive compliance rules so the end user does tasks as the author wants him or her to do. The present invention provides the author with the unique advantage of structuring the "noetica" in the same fashion he or she would map such questions/responses, solutions, objects in his or her own head. This advantage provides flexibility to emulate construction instead of rigid steps and paths towards constructing the author's tree (i.e. noetica).

Bertrand et al. does not disclose or teach, explicitly or inherently, each and every step and limitation of claim 38, as recited above. *Bertrand et al.* is directed to goal based learning system utilizing a rule based expert training system to provide a cognitive educational experience. A simulated learning experience is provided which presents a business opportunity to understand and solve optimally. Mistakes are noted and remedial educational materials are presented dynamically. The system uses an artificial intelligence engine which in turn relies on inference engines – patterned guesses and regression analysis within a learning experience. Mistakes within the learning experience are logged in order to dynamically build an individualized training exercise using the AI engine. A "real" business experience is attempted to be provided with "real" consequences for mistakes.

As claimed, the present invention does not have "wrong" answers, and does not build any applications dynamically. Specifically, the present invention requires at least: receiving a first question, a second question, and a third question from an expert, wherein none of the first, second, and third questions have an answer which is incorrect; receiving a first potential answer to the first question and a second potential answer to the first question from the expert, wherein both the first and second potential answers to the first question are correct answers to the first question, and wherein the first and second answers are utilized in a non-dynamic and pre-populated manner to create a compliance path; and receiving a first potential answer to the second question and a second potential answer to the second question from the expert, wherein both the first and second potential answers to the second question are correct answers to the second question, and wherein the first and second answers are utilized in a non-dynamic and pre-populated manner to create the compliance path. The above and other limitations make clear that compliance, not learning simulation, is the context of the present invention. Further the compliance application of the present invention is generated based on pre-logged questions,

answers, rules, and solutions, not dynamic triggering of learning simulations as a result of single or multiple wrong answers.

In the final Office Action the Examiner alleges that *Bertrand et al.* discloses, at least implicitly, Boolean rules being integrated into that system. *Bertrand et al.* does not disclose the inputting of a first and a second Boolean logic rule by the knowledge expert, the first Boolean logic rule *associating the first potential answer to the first question, the first potential answer to the second question, and the third question*, nor the second Boolean logic rule *associating the first potential answer to the first question, the second potential answer to the second question, and the solution*. The present invention as claimed in claim 38 specifically requires the rules generated by the system of the present invention to be "complex." A rule in the system of the present invention can require responses from more than one previous question. *Bertrand et al.* does not disclose or teach the use of "complex" rules. At most, *Bertrand et al.* may implicitly show simple "vectors," which takes a single answer and moves the user to a predetermined page, in the case of *Bertrand et al.*, the triggering of a Intelligent Coaching Agent (ICA) or additional questions.

The above and other differences clearly show that *Bertrand et al.* does not teach each and every limitation of claim 38, and therefore does not anticipate claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. §102. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the present rejection be withdrawn, as to claim 38. Applicant further respectfully requests that the rejections as to claims 49 and 60 be withdrawn, as these independent claims generally include the same limitations of claim 38, as indicated above.

Rejections of Dependent Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The remaining claims, which all depend from claims 38, 49, and 60, either directly or indirectly, have been rejected as being obvious in view of *Bertrand et al.* and *Fields et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,128,655). The Examiner has relied on *Bertrand et al.* to show each and every limitation of the base claims (38, 49, and 60) upon which all of the dependent claims rely. Therefore, the above amendments and remarks relating to claims 38, 49, and 60 also apply to the all of the dependent claims. Applicant, thus, respectfully requests that the rejections of all of the dependent claims be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the Amendments and Remarks above, Applicant believes the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests Examiner to issue a Notice of Allowance at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner would like to discuss the present Reply or application, Applicant requests the Examiner to contact the below-listed attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 30 MARCH 2005 By: _____

Roger H. Stein, Reg. No. 31,882
Wallenstein Wagner & Rockey, Ltd.
311 South Wacker Drive, 53rd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6630
312.554.3300

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (37 C.F.R. § 1.8a)
I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being deposited with the United States Postal Service, with first class postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on March 30, 2005.

Kathleen Rundquist

Kathleen Rundquist/222207